

Date: Fri, 29 Jan 93 07:59:12 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #131
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Fri, 29 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 131

Today's Topics:

6m and 10m HTs and mobile units, was...Re: New Products
Call book on-line??
I love/hate Wayne Green!
Info-Hams Digest
Info-Hams Digest V93 #130
LICENSE DELAYS
License Waiting Time
My call sign : (

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 93 18:30:37 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnewse!cbnewsd!
att-out!walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 6m and 10m HTs and mobile units, was...Re: New Products
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <C1JF08.EnI@amdcl2> brian@amdcl2.amd.com (Brian McMinn, N5PSS) writes:
>In the Feb 93 QST, I saw the following new products that looked
>interesting. I have no connections with either, but thought they were
>unusual enough to call attention to:
>
> Azden AX-21A, AZ-11, and AZ-61
>
> 6m and 10m HTs! (FM only) Azden is now in the HT business and
> their first three offerings are HT's for 2m, 6m and 10m. I've

> seen a lot of net requests over the years for a 10m HT. I
> called for a price and the 2m is \$330, 10m or 6m is \$320.

I heard about these in December and contacted Azden. Azden also has regular mobile units going through FCC type acceptance now also. They'll also be 6m and 10m units for FM only. Pricing for the units was estimated to be in the high \$300 range.

Looks like a nice addition to the 6 meter equipment availability situation.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1993 17:50:28 GMT
From: panix!oppedahl@nyu.arpa
Subject: Call book on-line??
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In <4124@hpwala.wal.hp.com> joes@hpwala.wal.hp.com (Joe Smulowicz) writes:

>Does anyone know how to get access to the on-line call book? I'm told there is
>one.....

Telnet to port 2000 of callsign.cs.buffalo.edu.

--
Carl Oppedahl AA2KW (intellectual property lawyer)
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112-0228
voice 212-408-2578 fax 212-765-2519

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1993 21:14:52 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!paladin.american.edu!gatech!news.byu.edu!eff!
world!sharon@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: I love/hate Wayne Green!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

tcain@brtph87.bnr.ca (Tom Cain WB8OUE) writes:

>I agree wholeheartedly!! I enjoy all of 73, but, Wayne's editorial is

>what makes the mag unique and always the first thing I read. Amateur
>radio NEEDS a rabble-rouser and Wayne does a great job at it!

There's a difference, in my opinion, between a "rabble-rouser" and an "egomaniac." My problem with Mr. Green is that, ultimately, one gets the impression from his pieces that he, personally, is more important than anything he writes about. It's always HE did this, HE did that, HE has done so many wonderful things. ... Blech. Perhaps this has changed recently -- we get the magazine because my husband likes it, but the only thing I look at is the 73 International section.

There are enough self-important bores in this world one is forced to listen to. I certainly don't feel like voluntarily using my precious spare time to read one every month!

Sharon KC1YR

--

Sharon Machlis Gartenberg
Framingham, MA USA
e-mail: sharon@world.std.com

Date: 29 Jan 93 12:56:54 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Info-Hams Digest
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

<Mark writes:

<Message 6/8 From Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup

Page 3

<Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1993 19:39:07 GMT
<From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!usenet@uunet.uu.net
<Subject: Advice on coax cable sources and prices?
<To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

<Greetings all...

<Several members of our club have decided to go together and purchase a
<quantity of coax cable. We're looking for around 1000' of Belden 9913.
<Does anyone out in net-land have any advice on good sources for that
<quantity? So far, the best I've found is AES at about \$.46 per foot +
<shipping for 500' spools. HRO price is \$.69 per foot + sales tax but I
<haven't persued a quantity price from them. Other are around \$.50 per foot
<+ shipping. Are these decent prices or can 9913 be had for less elsewhere?

<Any advice will be appreciated.

<Thanks & 73... Mark AA7TA

Try the Wireman, in South Carolina. He has ads in CQ and I think (not positive) in QST and 73.

Stan, KC4ZGF

Disclaimer: "All opinions are mine, not those of my employer".

```
-----
| Stanley D. Boyd |
| Project Manager-CALS Applications |
| Systems Integration |
| Intergraph Corporation |
| Mail Stop GD3005 |
| Huntsville, AL 35894-0001 |
| Phone: (205)730-3135 |
| FAX: (205)730-3301 |
| INTERNET: boyd@afsp.b30.ingr.com |
|-----
```

Date: 29 Jan 93 15:17:59 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #130
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

--- Errors encountered in recipients ---
No such mail name "t_alford" exists.

Mail not delivered to above addresses.
---Text of Message follows---

----- The following note was forwarded to you by AWAY... -----

Received: from mwunix.mitre.org by mwvm.mitre.org (IBM VM SMTP V2R1) with TCP;
Fri, 29 Jan 93 10:06:18 EST
Return-Path: <info-hams-relay@UCSD.EDU>
Received: from ucsd.edu by mwunix.mitre.org (5.65c/SMI-2.2)
id AA09615; Fri, 29 Jan 1993 10:06:10 -0500
Received: by ucsd.edu; id AA22574
sendmail 5.67/UCSD-2.2-sun
Fri, 29 Jan 93 04:30:22 -0800 for brian
Received: by ucsd.edu; id AA22569
sendmail 5.67/UCSD-2.2-sun
Fri, 29 Jan 93 04:30:18 -0800 for /usr/lib/sendmail -oc -odb

-oQ/var/spool/lqueue -oi -finfo-hams-relay info-hams-list
Message-Id: <9301291230.AA22569@ucsd.edu>
Date: Fri, 29 Jan 93 04:30:15 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #130
To: Info-Hams@UCSD.EDU

Info-Hams Digest Fri, 29 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 130

Today's Topics:

 Anyone test after Nov 14th get their license yet?
 Becoming active again (renewing license, etc.)
 Daily Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for 27 January
 Daily Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for 28 January

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 28 Jan 93 20:22:47 GMT
From: lll-winken!nirvana.llnl.gov!user@ames.arpa
Subject: Anyone test after Nov 14th get their license yet?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan26.131408.18233@shearson.com>,
mjohnsto@jenny.shearson.com (Mike Johnston) wrote:

>
>
> The suspense is killing me. Has anyone who tested after November
> 14th received their ticket from the FCC?
>
Tested Nov 21st-still no ticket.

The wait is almost over (has to be!)

Dave

Date: 28 Jan 93 22:02:42 GMT
From: ucsbcs1!seidel!maarrk@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Becoming active again (renewing license, etc.)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I used to be an active amateur radio operator, but have not been active for 5-6 years now. I'd like to get active again, but do not even have a copy of my license. I believe that my license is either still good or just expired.

I've got a Form 610 to send to the FCC. The form itself says nothing regarding fees for renewing/reinstating licenses. Is a fee required?

thanks,

--maarrk (maarrk@ruapehu.ece.ucsb.edu)

Date: 29 Jan 93 07:26:04 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Daily Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for 27 January
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

!!BEGIN!! (1.0) S.T.D. Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for DAY 027, 01/27/93
10.7 FLUX=111 90-AVG=136 SSN=061 BKI=1333 2211 BAI=008
BGND-XRAY=B2.8 FLU1=3.3E+05 FLU10=9.4E+03 PKI=1343 3211 PAI=010
BOU-DEV=007,025,037,030,010,015,006,005 DEV-AVG=016 NT SWF=00:000
XRAY-MAX= C1.5 @ 2138UT XRAY-MIN= B2.6 @ 1139UT XRAY-AVG= B3.5
NEUTN-MAX= +001% @ 2200UT NEUTN-MIN= -003% @ 2325UT NEUTN-AVG= -0.8%
PCA-MAX= +0.1DB @ 0605UT PCA-MIN= -0.2DB @ 2305UT PCA-AVG= -0.0DB
BOUTF-MAX=55434NT @ 2052UT BOUTF-MIN=55393NT @ 1918UT BOUTF-AVG=55405NT
GOES7-MAX=P:+102NT@ 2039UT GOES7-MIN=N:-005NT@ 1101UT G7-AVG=+075,+032,+008
GOES6-MAX=P:+113NT@ 1938UT GOES6-MIN=E:-007NT@ 2149UT G6-AVG=+085,+006,+045
FLUXFCST=STD:115,120,120;SESC:115,120,120 BAI/PAI-FCST=010,010,020/015,015,020
KFCST=2223 5222 2223 5222 27DAY-AP=010,008 27DAY-KP=1134 3211 2332 2222
WARNINGS=
ALERTS=
!!END-DATA!!

Date: 29 Jan 93 07:42:19 GMT

From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Daily Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for 28 January
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

!!BEGIN!! (1.0) S.T.D. Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for DAY 028, 01/28/93
10.7 FLUX=112.0 90-AVG=136 SSN=070 BKI=1323 2111 BAI=007
BGND-XRAY=B2.2 FLU1=2.9E+05 FLU10=9.1E+03 PKI=2322 2111 PAI=006
BOU-DEV=008,025,011,021,015,007,007,008 DEV-AVG=012 NT SWF=00:000
XRAY-MAX= B5.9 @ 1318UT XRAY-MIN= B1.9 @ 2359UT XRAY-AVG= B2.6
NEUTN-MAX= +001% @ 2255UT NEUTN-MIN= -003% @ 1315UT NEUTN-AVG= -0.5%
PCA-MAX= +0.1DB @ 2055UT PCA-MIN= -0.2DB @ 0800UT PCA-AVG= +0.0DB
BOUTF-MAX=55415NT @ 1606UT BOUTF-MIN=55395NT @ 2019UT BOUTF-AVG=55406NT
GOES7-MAX=P:+105NT@ 1949UT GOES7-MIN=N:+002NT@ 0845UT G7-AVG=+078,+031,+009
GOES6-MAX=P:+119NT@ 1736UT GOES6-MIN=E:-006NT@ 2151UT G6-AVG=+089,+003,+040
FLUXFCST=STD:115,120,120;SESC:115,120,120 BAI/PAI-FCST=010,020,015/010,020,015
KFCST=2223 5222 3334 5333 27DAY-AP=008,017 27DAY-KP=2332 2222 3235 4332
WARNINGS=
ALERTS=
!!END-DATA!!

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1993 15:42:24 GMT

From:

saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!
inac!att!cbnewsm!jeffj@ames.arpa

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan25.122611.63159@cc.usu.edu>, <C1FMMv.4o5@anomaly.sbs.com>,
<1993Jan26.222236.28877@rwwa.COM>u

Subject : Re: Real Extras (was Real NoCodes)

In article <1993Jan26.222236.28877@rwwa.COM> witr@rwwa.com writes:

>Since I have been assured that the Real NoCodes is ``just humor'' by
>the original poster, the I think we should have a little ``humor'' for
>the extras. I'm sure they won't mind.

>

> Real Extras

>

>1) Real Extras use foul language on 20. They collect NALs like
>they are merit badges.

>

>2) Real Extras are band police. They enjoy walking on other hams
>transmissions with their own (unidentified) ones, to protect the
>purity of the hobby. Combining this with #1 gives extra points.

>

>3) Real Extras don't know the regs. But they are very positive about
>their knowledge.

>
>4) Real Extras cultivate exceptionally fine B0. The truly accomplished
>ones have bad breath that would gag a yak.
>
>5) Real Extras generate harmonics when contesting on 10, and when a
>neighbor complains about the TVI, they tell them that they have a FCC
>license and to get lost and go buy a better TV.
>
>6) Real Extras use full legal limit (plus a little) to talk to their buddy
>across town.
>
>7) Real Extras chase ambulances so they can offer their ``communications''
>expertise.
>
>8) Real Extras tune up on top of existing QSOs.
>
>9) Real Extras join the pileup nomatter where the DX station is directing
>his calls.
>
>10) Real Extras have their repeaters ID at 30WPM. So what if the FCC
>doesn't like it?

I'm so embarrassed, I'm a (sigh) Extra and I don't do any of those things.
I feel like such a failure. Maybe this will help;

11) Real Extras talk about their gallstone surgeries at length.

12) Real Extras strut around like they won the place due to their incredible
expertise and wide ranging knowledge. All this was bestowed upon them
the minute they passed the 20wpm code test.

I'm feel so much better. 8-)

Jeff

--

Jeff Jones AB6MB	Hooker	: I'll do anything for \$50!
jeffj@seeker.mystic.com	Henny Youngman:	Will you paint my house?
Infolinc BBS 415-778-5929		

Date: 28 Jan 93 13:24:42 GMT

From:

sun-barr!cs.utexas.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!paladin
.american.edu!gatech!ukma!cs.widener.edu!dsinc!netnews.upenn.edu!prijat!triangl
e.cs.uofs.edu!bill@ames.arpa

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan27.184350.5273@linus.mitre.org>,
<1k6o7jINN29p@rave.larc.nasa.gov>, <8585@lib.tmc.edu>s.
Subject : Re: Burglars are brighter than you might think!

In article <8585@lib.tmc.edu>, jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard)
writes:
|> with... There are times I wish my computers were the same way. (Actually, one
|> of them is, too: my Unix box is about 150 pounds.)

I guess that means my Apollo and 2 PDP-11's are safe!! :-)

bill KB3YV

--

```
Bill Gunshannon      | "There are no evil thoughts, Mr. Reardon" Francisco  
bill@cs.uofs.edu     | said softly, "except one; the refusal to think."  
                     | #include <std disclaimer.h>
```

Date: 28 Jan 93 06:21:06 GMT
From: bobsbox.rent.com!s4mjs!kc2wz!bob@RUTGERS.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <C1H5rx.FGH@inews.Intel.COM>, <14570593@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com>,
<14570596@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com>edu
Subject : Re: Ham Radio Causes Cancer!

jreece@sousa.intel.com (John Reece) says:

[snip]

```
>> And even if there does turn out to  
>> be some effect, it's clear that it must be pretty small. (Even those  
>> studies that do show an effect place it far below the dangers of, say,  
>> cigarette smoking.)  
>  
>Just like the recent stories about cellular phones causing brain cancer  
>ignored the far more likely danger of users walking or driving into an  
>accident while using them....
```

The local news has been buzzing with the dangers of cell phone the passed few days. They always say that "scientists say there is no conclusive evidence yet but...". I am puzzled other forms of environmentally related cancer takes YEARS (20+) before rises above the "background noise". Seems none of "scare" reporters stop to think about this. Must be blissful to be really technically and scientifically ignorant. :-(

--

Bob Billson, KC2WZ | internet: bob@kc2wz.bubble.org
\$nail: 21 Bates Way, Westfield, NJ 07090 | uucp: ...!uunet!kc2wz!bob

"Friends don't let friends run DOS" -- Microware

Date: 28 Jan 93 15:19:39 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!NewsWatcher!user@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <N1-ls*8y0@lemsys.UUCP>, <1993Jan26.104432.1@kean.ucs.mun.ca>,
<1993Jan26.181953.25999@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>
Subject : Re: Real NoCodes_, Now CW and reality

In article <1993Jan26.181953.25999@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>,
jeffj@cbnewsm.cb.att.com (jeffrey.n.jones) wrote:

>

> You know if you read the posts here you would get the impression that the
> CW portions of the various bands were devoid of any activity at all.

I second that. I went ahead and learned the code and upgraded three weeks ago. After my first CW QSO on 40 meters, I was hooked. Every time I call CQ, I get an immediate response. I would suggest that most of those who predict and hope for the demise of CW have never used it...

* Chris Terwilliger, KB7PPT/AA rrgd50@email.sps.mot.com *
* Motorola "And now, the sequence of events, *
* 2100 E. Elliot Rd. EL374 in no particular order." *
* Tempe, AZ 85284 - Dan Rather *

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #130

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1993 09:49:19 -0500
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!linac!pacific.mps.ohio-
state.edu!cis.ohio-state.edu!news.sei.cmu.edu!bb3.andrew.cmu.edu!
crabapple.srv.cs.cmu.edu!andrew.cmu.edu!dm3e+@
Subject: LICENSE DELAYS
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Excerpts from netnews.rec.radio.amateur.misc: 27-Jan-93 Re: LICENSE
DELAYS Bill Mayhew@uhura.neouco (968)

> Here is an interesting observation: Some members of the local
> radio club finished a license course in mid-November 1992. Two men
> from the course took their no code tech exams just before
> Thanksgiving; they are still waiting for their tickets.

I took the test on No Code Tech exam on November 14, 1992. I still
haven't received my liscense. Would anybody that just recently received
their liscense please post when you took your test, and when you
received your liscense. I'd like to know when they get to the tests from
November '92. My guess is they're still working on September or October
:((

Thanks for any information,

David Markley
markley+@cmu.edu
N3N??

T+75 days since the exam
T-191 days of single life left ;) (Wonder which will come first...)

Date: 29 Jan 93 14:56:00 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: License Waiting Time
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Some data on waiting for a license:
We gave exams November 7, 1993
ARRL sent 610's to FCC November 17, 1993
Licenses arrived January 19, 1993 (10 weeks)

Jim,NX9F

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1993 22:11:45 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!engage.pko.dec.com!nnnpd.lkg.dec.com!nnnpd2.cxo.dec.com!
32799.enet.dec.com!yanagi@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: My call sign : (
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

My wife passed her test on 10/20/92 and got her license 1/2/93, so
mid-February would be a reasonable guess.

Good luck (and hang in there - I've been through your desperation!)

73,
John N2KJM

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 93 18:26:24 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnewse!cbnewsd!
att-out!walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <19930126.052628.195@almaden.ibm.com>,
<paulf.728071906@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993Jan26.193357.28674@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>70
Subject : Re: Three Minute Morse

>>devo@vnet.ibm.com (Dave Eaton) writes:
>>Somehow, lost in the noise, is the fact that, in addition to the surge of
>>codeless techs, there has also been a significant increase in the number
>>of hams upgrading in recent months. The reason is simple enough. It's
>>pretty well impossible to explain the utility of morse code to someone who is
>>outside of the hobby. From the inside, however, it's a different matter.
>>Personally, I had never planned on upgrading from tech when I got the license
>>in 1986; a few months on the air changed all that.

>
>Has anyone besides me noticed a surge in ads in the various ham radio
>magazines for all kinds of products for Amateur radio lately? Seems like
>every time I look in 73 and the others I see new stuff that I haven't seen
>before. The No-code techs are responsible for that folks! God Bless them!
>Maybe our ham radio magazines will resemble those in Japan where they are
>darn near the size of phone books in the near future. Let's see the hobby
>is growing almost at the rate of 10% per year now. In 7 years that's a
>doubling of size so we are looking at about 1.2 millions hams in 1999 as
>we are at about 600,00 now. That's a lot of new HT's and HF gear! Yes, the
>future looks bright for ham radio! You can quibble with the figures but
>they are in the general ball park. IF anyone has exact figures could you
>please post them? COME ON NO-CODE!!!! 73!

After 30 years (mostly inactive) I got back into ham radio about 2 years ago.
I have been incredibly impressed with the type and quality of today's
transcievers and after borrowing one for a while I really wanted to
get onto HF. I upgraded (only had to pass the 13 wpm), but I have NOT
used CW at all and have little desire to do so. (Note, I have not said
let's do away with the use of CW, etc.) So what did the 13 wpm do
for me...NADA. In a few months I'll likely be barely able to copy some
level of code at a much reduced rate from the 13wpm requirement.

I too think the growth of the numbers of hams is creating a great

incentive for the development of more and better equipment for all hams. Personally, I support Fred Maia's (W5YI) suggestion for a simplified license structure as he proposed in the Nov 92 CQ and revisited again in the January 93 CQ issue.

I'll likely take the Advanced test again in February to gain the access to the additional HF phone band segments, but I see little likelihood that I'll go for the extra as the additional HF phone segments that come with being an extra are minimal.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1993 16:55:37 GMT
From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!paladin.american.edu!darwin.sura.net!
sgiblab!cs.uoregon.edu!news.uoregon.edu!news.u.washington.edu!raven.alaska.edu!
news.acns.nwu.edu!casbah.acns.nwu.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1038@arrl.org>, <1993Jan26.152134.5792@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,
<1993Jan28.011847.19085@adobe.com>blab
Subject : Re: Ham Radio Causes Cancer!

In article <1993Jan28.011847.19085@adobe.com> swirsky@adobe.com (Robert Swirsky) writes:
>In article <1993Jan26.152134.5792@newsgate.sps.mot.com> rapw20@email.sps.mot.com writes:
>>Speaking of ham radio and cancer, I'm sure many of you have seen the news
>>coverage of the lawsuit accusing cellular phones of causing cancer. I saw
>>a report of it last night on NBC.
>
>I always thought that hams (and sw listeners &c.) could use this public
>concern over RF energy as a tool to overturn laws that restrict the
>reception of the Cellular Phone frequencies on certain scanners.
>
>You just have to convince the public, and your elected officials, that
>it is important to have the ability to monitor this radiation that some
>believe to cause health risks.

This is America, land of the lottery.
If someone sees that they can get BIG bucks with a lawsuit, they try.

If we, as hams, start giving this kind of thing ANY credence, who do you

think will be next? Do you want your neighbor to sue you if he gets cancer, just because you've been transmitting with your ham radio next door to him for years?

These lawsuits are a big danger to everyone who uses radios. The claims of them causing cancer are unsupported by any scientific data and are probably unfounded.

We have to do everything we can to convince the public that there is no basis to these claims, otherwise, we may be the next targets!

Greg Lapin
KD9AZ

Date: 28 Jan 1993 16:34:42 GMT
From: agate!spool.mu.edu!darwin.sura.net!mojo.eng.umd.edu!chuck@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1038@arrl.org>, <1993Jan26.152134.5792@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,
<1993Jan28.011847.19085@adobe.com>p
Subject : Cell Phones Cause Cancer! Was: Ham Radio Causes Cancer!

In article <1993Jan28.011847.19085@adobe.com> swirsky@adobe.com (Robert Swirsky) writes:
>In article <1993Jan26.152134.5792@newsgate.sps.mot.com> rapw20@email.sps.mot.com writes:
>>Speaking of ham radio and cancer, I'm sure many of you have seen the news
>>coverage of the lawsuit accusing cellular phones of causing cancer. I saw
>>a report of it last night on NBC.
>
>I always thought that hams (and sw listeners &c.) could use this public
>concern over RF energy as a tool to overturn laws that restrict the
>reception of the Cellular Phone frequencies on certain scanners.

Most likely, this tact will backlash against the only users of the RF spectrum that don't have high powered lobbysts: Radio Amateurs. We expose the unsuspecting public to that "deadly RF cancer causing stuff", and also screw up their television reception.

>You just have to convince the public, and your elected officials, that
>it is important to have the ability to monitor this radiation that some
>believe to cause health risks.
>
>An argument that would work in these environmentally sensitive times
>is that the cellular companies lobbied for the ban on receivers so that
>the public wouldn't be able to measure the amount of RF energy around them.

Hmmm? The problem here is that it doesn't take a real wizard to realize that there is no need to be able to demodulate the cell phone conversation in order to measure the RF field strength. All one needs is a field strength meter tuned to 800-900MHz.

The bill gave the FCC the authority to withhold type acceptance from SCANNING receivers that can cover, or easily be modified to cover, the cell phone frequencies.

Field strength meters and all other test equipment capable of receiving these frequencies are still legal. As are all manually tunable receivers that can tune the range... and all frequency converters that would convert the cell phone frequencies to frequencies receivable by "legitimate" scanning receivers.

If you want to pose an argument that will compell your congress critter to reverse this law; you might be better served by arguing that the cellular telephone companies special interests lobbies bribed the congressional committee members into passing this law. I don't think you will have any trouble finding evidence to support this conclusion.

73,

Chuck Harris - WA3UQV

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #131
